| Town Manager Approval: | |
|--|----|
| Item to be presented by: Vincent Suso | co |
| DATE: June 23, 2009 | |
| SUBJECT: Adopt Public Water System Budget and Water Rates for fiscal year 2009/10 | |
| DEPARTMENT: Water Pollution Control Authority | |
| RECOMMENDED ACTION The Town Council adopts the 2009/2010 water operating budget substantially in the form presented and the following rate structure effective July 15, 2009. | |
| Effective July 15, 2009 water billing rates are as follows: Equivalent Meter Units: \$9.30/EMU Commodity Charge: \$3.638/1000 gallons | |
| BACKGROUND The WPCA at a Special Meeting of June 16, 2009 unanimously recommended the annual Public Water System Budget (attached) and a 4.6% increase in water rates. | |
| ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS none | |
| FISCAL IMPACT The PWS budget for the Village Center and Royal Oaks Water System will require an anticipated contribution from the general fund equal to \$40,715.00. | |
| EH: Clerks Office AGENDA ITEM: 4A | |

Town of East Hampton

Water Pollution Control Authority P.O. Box 218, 20 Gildersleeve Drive East Hampton, Connecticut 06424-0218 Telephone (860) 267-2536, FAX (860) 267-9913

To: Members of the Town Council

XC: Town Manager, Finance Director

Date: June 17, 2009

Re: Proposed Public Water Systems Operating Budget - F/Y 2009-10

From: V. F. Susco, Jr., PUA

Attached you will find the proposed operating budget for the two (2) public water systems operated by the WPCA. This budget was recommended by the WPCA at a Special Meeting held on June 16, 2009. As with past budgets, this budget was developed based upon current operating conditions and known operational changes necessary to operate the systems as efficiently as possible.

A FSeeseo/

OPERATIONS:

Town Center Water System

The operation of the TCWS has entered a new era of efficiency with the rebuilding of the water treatment plant. Gone are the days when a leak at a customer's premise would render the system inoperable........gone are the days of notifying the Department of Health that we were required to purchase water in order to keep the system pressurized. At every WPCA meeting since the system went on line in October of 2008 we have reported that the system continues to run within parameters. This greater degree of dependability will translate into a more cost effective system.

We did receive one "Notice of Violation" from the CTDPH for the system which required notification of our customers (April 17, 2009). This reporting violation was for a 2007 water quality monitoring requirement and had no bearing on water quality.

Royal Oaks Water System

This is the fourth year of operation for the ROWS. At the present time we serve 72 residential customers. Due to the economy we anticipate it will be some time before all the homes are built. The integration of the Memorial School Water System with the ROWS has made both systems more reliable as during the year each was required to produce water to supply the other.

In November we successfully incorporated corrosion control equipment into the treatment scheme. The increase in the pH value will reduce the likelihood of further lead and copper monitoring violations.

Operation issues with the chlorine and potassium permanganate feed systems have been traced to inoperable solenoid valves and media change outs for the iron/manganese filters. Based upon current water quality and demand we anticipate this to become a routine operation every other year. Future budgets will account for this cost.

We presently are down one part time operator and anticipate that to be remedied in the near future, We have however, continued to meet Federal and State operating parameters for both systems on a 24/7 basis. We continue to employ a third party Class II Chief Operator for both water systems.

FINANCES:

Revenues for both systems are tracking behind what was projected: the VCWS water system has several properties that became vacant during the year and revenues for the ROWS are lower than projected due to lower per capita consumption and fewer customers.

As of March 31, 2009, revenues for both systems totaled \$32,605.00. On a pro forma basis revenues for this year are projected to be \$42,900.00. This number was confirmed by Finance on June 15, 2009. Revenues for the year will be approximately \$9,500.00 under budget for both systems.

Delinquent accounts have been minimized with the institution of monthly billing however we are required to remain vigilant with our collection efforts.

As of March 31, 2009, expenditures for both systems totaled \$57,000.00. We are presently estimating expenditures to be in line with what has been budgeted for the fiscal year, i.e. \$93,895.00. We are projecting a fiscal fund deficit of \$50,915.00 (\$93,895.00-\$42,980.00) at 6/30/09. This compares to \$75,882.00 in 2006/07 and \$55,000.00 in 2007/08. This of course would be subject to a final audit.

Expenditures for 2009/2010 have been projected to be in line with this year's expense, \$94,145.00 or 0.27% higher than last year. Revenues (with a recommended proposed increase in water rates - see below) have been estimated at \$53,430.00. Continuing with the direction received in the past, on a pro-forma basis this results in a projected annual fund deficit of \$40,715.00 as of 6/30/10.

To mitigate future deficits and to address *future* operational concerns the Town recently adopted "Regulations for Acceptance of Public Water Systems under the Certificate of Public Convenience & Necessity for those systems operated by the WPCA.

WATER RATE RECOMMENDATION:

Attached you will find a current *water rate comparison sheet*. This pier group contains 6 water utilities (4 municipal and 2 private). The current water rates, established last year, are \$8.75/EMU (Equivalent Meter Unit) and \$3.465/1000 gallons. The typical annual cost of water (72,000 gpy) for customers served by the Town is \$357.00. By comparison:

Average of pier group: \$435.08 Average of 4 surrounding Towns: \$396.90 Average of 2 CWS in EH: \$511.44

Continuing increases in operating costs and the desire to reduce the Town's Contribution (annual fund deficit) require additional increases in both EMU (8.5%) and Commodity charge (5.0%). The annual cost of water for customers served by the Town with these new rates would be \$373.56 per year yielding an overall increase of 4.6%. Additional increases to bring Town costs in line with the pier group have been provided in the *water rate comparison sheet*.

Proposed Resolution: that the Town Council adopt the 2009/10 water operating budget substantially in the form presented and that the following rate structure be adopted effective July 15, 2009.

Effective July 15, 2009 water billing rates are as follows:

- Equivalent Meter Units: \$9.30/EMU
- Commodity Charge: \$3.638/1000 gallons

WPCA MAY 5, 2009 AGENDA ITEM #XX

Current Water Rate Costs based upon typical yearly consumption of 72,000 gallons

| | \$ 435.08 | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Glastonbury | 349.80 | 2.95 11.45 |
| | ക ക | |
| Middletown Water | 285.74 | 2.93 6.23 |
| M | ക ക | ↔ ↔ |
| Portland Water | 391.92 | 4.61 5.00 |
| <u>a</u> – , | () | ω ω |
| Colchester | 560.12 1.53 | 7.17 |
| OS - | | ⇔ ↔ |
| Connecticut Water Co | \$ 573.12 | 4SS "A" 3/31/09 |
| Aquarion | \$ 449.75 | |
| Royal Oaks | 357.00 | 3.50 |
| ల ర | ⇔ ↔ | 03 03 |
| Village Center | \$ 357.00 | \$ 3.50 |
| | Annual Cost daily avg. \$ | Commodity \$ Mnthly Meter \$ rates est. 7/1/08 |

Town Water Rates required to equal average of 4 surrounding towns

| | Village Center | Royal Oaks | Colchester Water | Portland Water | Middletown Water | Glastonbury MDC | 4 | 4 Town Avg. |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----|----------------|
| Annual Cost | \$ 399.00 | \$ 399.00 | \$ 560.12 | \$ 391.92 | \$ 285.74 | \$ 349.80 | 69 | 396.90 |
| daily avg. \$ | \$ 1.09 | \$ 1.09 | \$ 1.53 | \$ 1.07 | \$ 0.78 | \$ 0.96 | ↔ | 1.09 |
| Commodity \$ | \$ 4.00 | \$ 4.00 | 14.29% % | 4.29% % increase needed | Comments: | | | |
| Mnthly Meter \$ | \$ 9.25 | \$ 9.25 | 5.71% % | 5.71% % increase needed | | | | |

Town Water Rates required to equal average of the 2 community water systems in East Hampton

| 2 CWS Avg. | \$ 511.44 | \$ 1.40 | Comments: | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Connecticut Water Co | \$ 573.12 | \$ 1.57 | 47.14% % increase needed | increase needed |
| Aquarion Water | \$ 449.75 | \$ 1.23 | 47.14% % | 31.43% % |
| Royal Oaks | \$ 508.80 | 4 1.39 | \$ 5.15 | \$ 11.50 |
| Village Center | \$ 508.80 | \$ 1.39 | \$ 5.15 | \$ 11.50 |
| | Annual Cost | daily avg. \$ | Commodity \$ | Mnthly Meter \$ |



Town of East Hampton

Water Pollution Control Authority

2009 – 2010 Public Water Systems Operation Budget

63-59-0000-XXXX VCWS

63-59-0590-XXXX ROWS

Recommended by WPCA: June 16, 2009

Proposed Adoption by Town Council:

June 23, 2009

East Hampton Water Pollution Control Authority Community Water Systems Fiscal Year Budget - 2009-10

Page 1 of 3

| REVENUES | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Residential Consumption Estimated | | | |
| | vcws | ROWS | |
| Est. daily cons./unit (gals.) | 350 inc. | 200 red. | |
| Mthly. consumption (gals.) | 10,500 | 6,000 | |
| Mthly. commodity cost (\$/1000gals.) | \$3.638 5% | \$3.638 | |
| Monthly commodity charge (\$) | \$38.20 | \$21.83 | |
| Monthly meter cost (1EMU = \$8.75) | \$9.30 8.5% | \$9.30 | |
| Per unit monthly cost (\$) | \$47.50 | \$31.13 | |
| Homes/units | 29 | 75 | |
| Estimated monthly revenue | \$1,378 | \$2,335 | |
| | | | |
| Est. Residential yearly revenue | \$ 16,531 | \$ 28,017 | \$44,547 |
| | | | |
| | Ctr. Sch. | Mem. Sch. | |
| Monthly meter cost (15 EMU = \$9.30) | \$ 140 | | |
| daily consumption (gals/day) | 1,300 | | |
| Monthly commodity charge (\$) | \$ 142 | | |
| Monthly meter cost (20 EMU = \$9.30) | | \$ 186 | |
| daily consumption (gals/day) | | 2,500 | |
| Monthly commodity charge (\$) | | \$ 273 | |
| Estimated monthly revenue | \$ 281 | \$ 459 | |
| | | | |
| Est. Institutional yearly revenue | \$ 3,377 | \$ 5,506 | \$8,883 |
| | | | |
| Estimated total revenue 09/10 | \$ 19,907 | \$ 33,523 | <u>\$53,430</u> |
| | | | |

<u>Community Water Systems Budget 2009-10</u> <u>BALANCE SHEET COMBINED BUDGETS</u>

| EXPENDITURES | | | į | Page 2 of 3 |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| | Approved 08-09 Budget | Proposed 09-10 Budget | \$ +/- \$ | s +/- |
| 5120 - P\T Seasonal P\R | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5319 - Meetings/Conf. | 1,200 | 1,200 | 0 | |
| Certification Training | | | | |
| Conf./Seminars | | | | |
| 5330 - Prof/Tech Services | 15,500 | 8,500 | (7,000) | -82.35% |
| Water Quality Testing (DOHS) | | | | |
| Professional Services | | | | |
| Annual Auditing Reports | 4.750 | 4.050 | 100 | 2.060/ |
| 5430 - Bldg & Equip. Mnt & Rep. | 4,750 | 4,850 | 100 | 2.06% |
| snow plow RO by WPCA Generator Maintance | | | | |
| misc spare parts | | | | |
| 5436 - Underground Tank Testing | 23,040 | 24,922 | 1,882 | 7.55% |
| w/e monitoring, p\t operators | 63164-23153B | | | |
| 5440 - Rental\Contract | 1,000 | 700 | (300) | -42.86% |
| Generator yearly inspection | | | | |
| 5520 - Prop/Liab Ins | 2,300 | 2,550 | 250 | 9.80% |
| 5530 - Communications | 1,175 | 1,175 | 0 | |
| Nextel, Telephone, Postage | The state of the state of | | | |
| 5540 - Newspaper Advertising | 300 | 300 | 0 | |
| 5580 - Travel | 4,015 | 6,000 | 1,985 | 33.08% |
| 5590 - Other Purch. Services | 9,500 | 10,658 | 1,158 | 10.87% |
| Billing Administration (est. 107 cust.) | | | | |
| Flushing Water Lines Meter Installations | | | | |
| Annual Cross Connection Report | | | | |
| 5611 - Office Supplies | 1,000 | 500 | (500) | -100.00% |
| 5615 - Uniform Allowance | 500 | 600 | 100 | 16.67% |
| 5622 - Electricity | 13,300 | 16,500 | 3,200 | 19.39% |
| 5627 - Motor Fuel | 900 | 700 | (200) | -28.57% |
| 5627 - Diesel Fuel | 800 | 800 | | |
| 5680 - Chemicals | 1,900 | 2,325 | 425 | 18.28% |
| 5690 - Other Supp/Materials | 2,200 | 1,650 | (550) | -33.33% |
| water meter purchase | | 7.287 | | 75.000 |
| 5744 - Computer Equip | 700 | 400 | (300) | -75.00% |
| 5810 - Dues & Fees | 815 | 815 | 0 | |
| AWWA \$315.00 | | | | |
| CWWA \$250.00 DEP Gen. Permit \$125.00 | | | | |
| 5923 - Oper. Transfer to S.F. | 3,500 | 3,500 | 0 | 0.00% |
| 5980 - Res for Cap & NR | 1,750 | 1,750 | 0 | 0.00% |
| 5990 - Contingency | 3,750 | 3,750 | 0 | 0.00% |
| TOTAL | 93,895 | 94,145 | 250 | 0.27% |

Individual Water Systems Budget 2009-2010

| 2009-2 | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| <u>EXPENDITURES</u> | | Page 3 of 3 |
| | TCWS | ROWS |
| 5120 - P\T Seasonal P\R | | |
| 5319 - Meetings/Conf. | | |
| Certification Training | 300 | 300 |
| Conf./Seminars | 300 | 300 |
| 5330 - Prof/Tech Services | | |
| Water Quality Testing (DOHS) | 2,000 | 3,000 |
| Professional Services | 1,000 | 2,000 |
| Annual Auditing Reports | 250 | 250 |
| 5430 - Bldg & Equip. M & Rep. | | |
| snow plow RO by WPCA | | 750 |
| | | |
| Plumbing repairs | 300 | 300 |
| Generator Maintance | 300 | 200 |
| spare koh/ch- mixer | | 3,000 |
| 5436 - Underground Tank Testing | 12,461 | 12,461 |
| 24/7 monitoring wp/t operators | | |
| 5440 - Rental\Contract | 250 | 450 |
| Generator yearly inspection | | |
| | E BASICIENTES | TO PERSON THE |
| 5520 - Prop/Liab Ins (Inc 5%) | 1,275 | 1,275 |
| 5530 - Communications | 550 | 625 |
| Nextel, At&T, Snet,Postage | | |
| 5540 - Newspaper Advertising | 100 | 200 |
| 5580 - Travel | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 5590 - Other Purch, Services | 2,674 | 7,984 |
| Billing Administration (est. 111 cust.) | 1,914 | 5,904 |
| Meter Installations (10) | 1,514 | 600 |
| Locate leaks fix/meter/radio | 600 | 1,000 |
| | 000 | 400 |
| Flushing Water Lines 2 times a yr | 160 | 80 |
| Annual Cross Connection Report 5611 - Office Supplies | 250 | 250 |
| 5615 - Uniform Allowance | 300 | 300 |
| | 9,500 | 7,000 |
| 5622 - Electricity | 350 | 350 |
| 5627 - Motor Fuel | The second second | 400 |
| 6522 - Diesel Fuel 5680 - Chemicals | 400 800 | 1,525 |
| | 400 | 1,250 |
| 5690 - Other Supp/Materials | 400 | 1,250 |
| water meter purchase | 200 | 200 |
| 5744 - Computer Equip | 200 | |
| 5810 - Dues & Fees | 408 | 407 |
| AWWA (1 full & 1 1/2) \$315.00 | | |
| CWWA (1 full & 1 1/2) \$250.00 | | |
| DEP Gen. Permit (2) \$125.00 | 4 750 | 4.750 |
| 5923 - Oper. Transfer to S.F. | 1,750 | 1,750 |
| 5980 - Res for Cap & NR | 875 | 875 |
| 5990 - Contingency | 1,875 | 1,875 |
| TOTAL | 44,542 | 60,261 |
| | 94. | 145 |

Town Manager Approval:

Item to be presented by: Keith Hayden

DATE:

June 23, 2009

SUBJECT:

Cost analysis of bidding construction projects vs. hiring workers and renting

equipment.

DEPARTMENT:

Public Works

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the existing practice of advertising for sealed bids and hiring contractors based on the lowest bid from a qualified contractor for large construction projects continue.

BACKGROUND

At the June 9, 2009 meeting of the Town Council the suggestion was made to hire temporary construction employees and rent construction equipment in lieu of the existing practice of contracting out. For discussion purposes the recently opened bid for the Flanders Road Improvement Project is used for comparison. The same bid items and quantities are used and a thorough review has been made to anticipate the manpower and equipment that would be required for the project.

Below is the estimated minimum staffing level to complete the project. The hourly wages are the entry levels taken from the current union contract. The contract is for 17 weeks.

| Labor | Qty | \$/hr | BF&O | \$/Wk | 17 Wks | Drug Testing | Sick Days | Totals |
|---------------------|-----|----------|--------|------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| Forman | 1_ | \$20.70 | \$5.18 | \$1,035.00 | \$17,595.00 | \$200.00 | \$621.00 | \$18,416.00 |
| Equipment operators | 4 | \$16.55 | \$4.14 | \$3,310.00 | \$56,270.00 | \$200.00 | \$1,986.00 | \$58,456.00 |
| Laborers | 4 | \$15.37 | \$3.84 | \$3,074.00 | \$52,258.00 | \$200.00 | \$1,844.40 | \$54,302.40 |
| Inspector | 1 | \$55.00* | \$0 | \$2,200.00 | \$37,400.00 | \$0 | \$0 | \$37,400.00 |
| Flaggers | 2 | \$15.37 | \$3.84 | \$1,537.00 | \$26,129.00 | \$200.00 | \$922.20 | \$27,251.20 |
| : DI / - - | | 2 | | | | | Labor Total | \$195825.60 |

^{*} Based on the hourly inspection rate charged by CLA.

Below is the equipment necessary for the project. Rental rates are as quoted from Acorn.

| Equipment Description | Function | Qty. | \$/Mo. | Months | Cost |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------|---|--------|----------|
| Excavator | Drainage | 1 | \$2,700 | 3.0 | \$8,100 |
| Paver | Pavement | 1 | \$8,250 | 0.5 | \$4,125 |
| Grader | Subgrade | 1 | \$8,190 | 0.5 | \$4,095 |
| Roller | Subgrade and pavement | 2 | \$2,295 | 2.0 | \$9,180 |
| Mason Dump | Drainage | 1 | \$1,000 | 2.0 | \$2,000 |
| Tri-axle | Earth movement | 2 | \$1,500 | 3.0 | \$9,000 |
| Dozer | Grading | 1 | \$2,000 | 2.0 | \$4,000 |
| Guidrail Installation Truck | Guiderail | 1 | \$1,500 | 0.5 | \$750 |
| Road Saw | Cutting Pavement | 1 | \$666 | 0.5 | \$333 |
| Density Tester | Compaction | 1 | \$750 | 3.0 | \$2,250 |
| Chipper | Clearing and Grubbing | 1 | \$1,060 | 0.5 | \$530 |
| | | | 1 | Total | \$44.363 |

Below is a breakdown of quantities taken from the contract documents for the Flanders Road Improvement Project. The prices are estimates of what we can expect to pay.

| Materials | Units | Qty | EH Price | Totals | CAS Bid Price** | CAS Total |
|---------------------------|-------|------|------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|
| Maint. & Prot. of Traffic | L.S. | 1 | * | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| Clearing and Grubbing | L.S. | 1 | * | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$9,000 |
| Sed & Erosion Control | L.S. | 1 | * | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |
| Excavation | CY | 2500 | * | \$0 | \$10 | \$25,000 |
| Rock Exc. & Disposal | CY | 500 | * | \$0 | \$70 | \$35,000 |
| Gravel Fill | CY | 500 | \$15.00 | \$7,500 | \$20 | \$10,000 |
| Subbase | CY | 1300 | \$20.00 | \$26,000 | \$25 | \$32,500 |
| Processed Base | CY | 650 | \$20.00 | \$13,000 | \$35 | \$22,750 |
| Crushed Stone | CY | 50 | \$25.00 | \$1,250 | \$40 | \$2,000 |
| 2" Crushed Stone | CY | 75 | \$25.00 | \$1,875 | \$40 | \$3,000 |
| Temporary Pavement | SY | 250 | \$7.00 | \$1,750 | \$15 | \$3,750 |
| Permanent Pavement | SY | 60 | \$7.00 | \$420 | \$20 | \$1,200 |
| Bit Lip Curbing | LF | 2400 | \$2.00 | \$4,800 | \$4 | \$9,600 |
| Bit Conc Driveways | SY | 4000 | \$7.00 | \$28,000 | \$3 | \$12,240 |
| Bit. Pavement | Tons | 1400 | \$65.00 | \$91,000 | \$85 | \$119,000 |
| 15 HDPE | LF | 950 | \$10.00 | \$9,500 | \$40 | \$38,000 |
| 18 HDPE | LF | 400 | \$12.00 | \$4,800 | \$44 | \$17,600 |
| 24 HDPE | LF | 20 | \$14.00 | \$280 | \$48 | \$960 |
| Catch Basins | Ea | 22 | \$400.00 | \$8,800 | \$1,850 | \$40,700 |
| RipRap | CY | 20 | \$25.00 | \$500 | \$50 | \$1,000 |
| Underdrain | LF | 500 | \$5.00 | \$2,500 | \$25 | \$12,500 |
| Concrete Headwall | Ea | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 | \$2,500 | \$5,000 |
| Sedimentation Structure | Ea | 1 | \$2,500.00 | \$2,500 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| Load & Seed | SY | 2500 | \$2.75 | \$6,875 | \$5 | \$12,500 |
| Erosion Control Matting | SY | 650 | \$1.50 | \$975 | \$3 | \$1,950 |
| Metal Beam Rail | LF | 630 | \$14.00 | \$8,820 | \$33 | \$20,790 |
| Concrete Block Wall | SF | 1600 | \$12.00 | \$19,200 | \$22 | \$35,200 |
| Grass Lined Swale | L.S. | 1 | * | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| | | | Total | \$243,345 | CAS Total | \$483,240 |

^{*} Materials negligible, mostly labor

^{**} Price includes Labor and Equipment

| Labor | \$195,825 |
|-----------|-----------|
| Materials | \$243,345 |
| Equipment | \$44,363 |
| Total | \$483,533 |

This figure initially shows a \$6,000 savings but this is not realistic. There are addition costs that are difficult to assess. Added to the above total is the unemployment compensation that the Town will have to pay after the crew is laid off after construction, administrative recruitment costs, vehicle maintenance, and fuel.

Other concerns are:

- 1. Can the Town get the same production rate as the Contractor from a crew that has never worked together before? If not, there will be additional labor costs that need to be added into the analysis.
- 2. Will highly skilled and qualified workers accept the job knowing that the plan is to lay them off after construction is completed?
- 3. The Town will need to hire above entry level to get qualified equipment operators. Will there be issues with the union?
- 4. Federal funds will require a sealed bidding process for large cost materials anyway.
- 5. The Federal Government will most likely take issue with the town performing the work and performing the inspection. Therefore we would need to hire a consultant to perform the inspection work. Otherwise this could be interpreted as a conflict of interest.
- 6. If this is the best process, how come every other town in the state isn't already doing this?
- 7. The above items were confirmed in a telephone conversation with the DOT.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

None. A sealed competitive bid process ensures fairness and transparency in bidding.

FISCAL IMPACT

Continuing to advertise for sealed bids for large construction projects will ensure that the Town remains eligible for State and Federal funding while getting the lowest price possible.

EH: Clerks Office

| AGENDA ITEM: | 6B |
|----------------|----|
| TODITOTA ITEM. | |

| Town Manager Approval: | JAC- |
|------------------------|------|
| | |

Item to be presented by: Jef

Jeffery J. O'Keefe

DATE: June 23, 2009

SUBJECT: Update on Noise Control initiatives

DEPARTMENT: Town Managers Office

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive report and update on noise control options

BACKGROUND

At the June 9th Council meeting a lengthy discussion took place about a possible noise ordinance and noise control or abatement options.

Staff was directed to work with the owner of Angelico's to see what could be done to control noise more effectively. Particular attention was being placed on the out door band(s) that play there from Thursday thru Sunday during the evening and on Sunday afternoons. Additional, comments were made about the noise emanating from motorcycles.

The Town Manager spoke briefly with Mr. Angelico Sunday afternoon at the establishment and discussed possible options, as well as to experience first hand the amount of noise emanating from the establishment. On this particular day, there was a one man band playing mostly acoustics and the noise did not seem to be intrusive. In discussing options, with Mr. Angelico, he indicated that he is looking at building a band shell, but that it would require a site plan and zoning permits, which was affirmed by the planning department. Mr. Angelico does not anticipate a shell will be built this summer season. He did, however, indicate that he was looking at other options. He spoke briefly about hanging some "sound proof" blankets that possibly could absorb a great deal amount of sound. However, Mr. Angelico has not committed to doing this as of this writing.

For the weekend of June 13 and 14th there was one complaint for noise. And for the weekend of June 20 and 21st, there were (will have this number at the council meeting) complaints for noise.

Additionally, Town Staff has procured a noise meter and will be monitoring and reporting back to the council on noise concerns and findings from the noise meter throughout Town at a later council meeting.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS None requested at this time

FISCAL IMPACT

EH: Clerks Office

AGENDA ITEM:_____

Town Manager Approval:

Item to be presented by: Kerry Nielson, Director of Community & Environmental Planning

DATE: June 23, 2009

SUBJECT: Update on the Orientation Manual for New Commission, Committee, & Board Members

DEPARTMENT: Building, Planning & Zoning Dept.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Review the table of contents and draft of orientation document to be given to new members of town commissions, committees, and boards.

BACKGROUND

At the Town Council meeting on June 9, 2009, an update was given on the steps and timeline for the implementing the operational and organizational recommendations that came out of the "Functional Assessment Review and Recommendations Report" that was completed for the town this year by Ekman Consulting. One of the bigger recommendations that came out of the report was for the town to complete a manual or orientation type document to be one in the same for new members of any town commission or board. Attached is a draft of the document being worked on, including the table of contents. Since the document is still draft and pages aren't complete yet, please review table of contents mostly for completeness of items to be put in the manual and format of manual. The orientation manual will be given to new volunteers to be on a town board or commission. This will help them to understand what is expected and to have conformance and uniformity of procedures of commissions and boards. This orientation packet for commission members will help streamline commissions and how they function, as well as their effectiveness as an action based group within the town, and help to answer any questions on what they are charged to do for the town. Staff will continue to finish up this orientation manual and it is anticipated that a final draft of the document will be available at the Town Council meeting on July 14, 2009.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Other direction as determined by the Town Council.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

EH: Clerks Office

Town Manager Approval:

Item to be presented by: Keith Hayden

DATE:

June 23, 2009

SUBJECT:

Pine Brook Action Plan.

DEPARTMENT:

Public Works

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the following Pine Brook Action Plan developed from input from Public Works, Fire and Police be adopted by the Town Council to address safety of the traveling public and local residents in the event of a flood event or unforeseen emergency. The action plan is as follows:

Pine Brook Action Plan

The Department of Public Works will continue to maintain Pine Brook Road through snow plowing, annual grading, pot hole patching and cleaning of the roadside drainage ditches. In the event that the road becomes impassible due to the physical condition of the surface (i.e. muddy conditions or surface erosion) the Public Works Department will respond immediately and repair the road to the best of their ability and open the road to traffic as soon as possible.

Residents will be advised (by existing signage and a copy of this plan) that in the event of an emergency whereby the road is flooded they are directed to call 911 and not drive over the flooded roadway.

The residents are further advised to call 911 to report any other emergencies requiring immediate response.

The Public Works, Fire and Police Departments will respond as directed to all emergencies and take appropriate action that will depend on the specific nature of the emergency.

In the event that the Town can no longer maintain the road and provide for public safety and safe access a new action will be developed addressing these issues and implemented accordingly.

BACKGROUND

Pine Brook Road has a history of flooding during recent heavy rain events. The road crosses over Pine Brook via a metal culvert that was installed some time in the past. Recently Public Works Installed guiderail along both sides of the road to protect the traveling public from the previously unprotected drop off into the brook. Signs have been installed advising people not to drive into the water should it overtop the road.

Public Works along with the Fire and Police Departments have evaluated the existing condition of the road, culvert and the guiderail and found that currently there are no inaccessibility issues and further that all residential, town, service and emergency vehicles are able to cross the culvert.

| A T | TED | A T A | TIX | 7 T. A | CTI | ONIC |
|-----|-----|-------|-----|--------|-----|------|
| AL | IEK | INA | | / E A | | ONS |

Not adopt this action plan.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no immediate fiscal impact to the adoption of this plan.

EH: Clerks Office

AGENDA ITEM: ____7C___

Town Manager Approval: _

Item to be presented by: Keith Hayden

DATE:

June 23, 2009

SUBJECT:

Flanders Road Improvement Project No. 2

DEPARTMENT:

Public Works

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the contract be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder, C.A.S. Construction Company.

BACKGROUND

On May 11, 2009 the Town solicited for bids for the Flanders Road Improvement Project No. 2. The project was advertised on the State's DAS website and eight (8) companies submitted sealed bids.

CLA Engineers Inc. reviewed the bids and has recommended that the contract be awarded to CAS Construction Co., Inc. CLA's letter dated June 15, 2009 is attached for your reference. The low bid is less than the budgeted amount of \$550, 000.

The bid results are as follows:

| C.A.S. Construction Company | \$489,490.00 |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| B&W Paving and Landscaping | \$519,411.00 |
| American Industries, Inc. | \$572,416.40 |
| Cherry Hill Construction | \$586,785.00 |
| Pierce Builders | \$589,193.54 |
| Butler Construction | \$596,420.00 |
| Suchocki & Sons | \$596,985.58 |
| Sullivan Paving | \$641,129.00 |

A detailed breakdown of the bid prices for each item is attached.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS

Not award the bid and re-advertise the project.

FISCAL IMPACT

\$489,490 construction costs.

EH: Clerks Office

AGENDA ITEM: 8A

Nancy Hasselman, CCMC Collector of Revenue Town of East Hampton

June 23, 2009

To: The East Hampton Town Council

Please find copies of tax refunds for your review. The total refunds equal \$267.01.

Thank you for your assistance.

Mancy Hasselman, come

Nancy Hasselman, CCMC

Collector of Revenue

 $0 \cdot C$

141.33 +

56.95 -

36.35 +

32 · 38 + 68 · 32 +

7.74 +

343.07 *

006